

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 16-19, 23, and 24 amended and Claims 2, 3, 6, and 22 were cancelled by Applicant 17 August 2007. In this paper, claim 1 is amended to clarify the language by reciting system components and properties separately and replacing the term for a user that is a server with the term "provider" and the term "answer" with "results." Dependent claims have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the system comprises a data exchange network and a central data memory. Support for this amendment may be found on page 5, lines 4-6 of the specification. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the provider transmits results directly and/or via the central data memory to the receiver without any further instructions from the receiver. Support for this amendment may be found on page 12, line 10 to page 13, line 5 of the specification. Claim 5 is amended to recite that users edit answers to provide information beyond the question posted by the receiver. Support for this amendment may be found on page 5, lines 11-18 and page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 2 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Supplemental Arguments: Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, and 16-22 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,769,013 (Frees). In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite limitations from claims 2, 3, 6, and 17. Claim 1, as amended recites a system for the exchange of electronic data for optimizing a processing chain and/or a management chain for producing agricultural products between a plurality of users by means of at least one data exchange system.

Frees discloses a system and method to create a collaborative environment for members of a team in communication with a computer network (col. 2, lines 5-7). The team members are people and the system and method are used by the team to reach a collectively derived decision.

With regard to claims 1 and 18, Frees does not disclose a method or system for optimizing a processing chain and/or a management chain for producing agricultural products.

Regarding claim 1, Frees does not disclose a central data memory or that the provider transmits results directly and/or via the central data memory to the receiver without any further instructions from the receiver.

With regard to claim 5, Frees does not disclose users editing answers to provide information beyond the question posted by the receiver. The team members in Frees provide information to other team members but a question asked by a team member is not edited by a team member who did not receive the question.

Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frees in view of US 6,995,675 (Curkendall) and claims 7, 9-11, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frees in view of US 2002/0049727 (Rothkopf).

Frees teaches a system and method for to create a collaborative environment for members of a team in communication with a computer network (col. 2, lines 5-7). The team members are people and the system and method are used by the team to reach a collectively derived decision. Curkendall teaches a computer software program for tracking processing events for an agricultural product that minimizes keyboard entry (col. 1, lines 16-23). One skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made would have had no motivation to combine a system and method for reaching a collective decision that requires keyboard entry from all members (Frees) with a

software program designed to minimize keyboard entry in a repetitive process such as quality control of meat products.

Rothkopf teaches a method for providing customized information from a plurality of sources to an aggregation of individuals, based on their common affiliation (paragraph 6). Neither Frees nor Rothkopf involve agricultural methods or technologies. Frees teaches a system based on interactive collaboration while Rothkopf teaches a method of identifying groups of people to receive information (one way communication). One skilled in the art of agricultural production, at the time that the invention was made, would have had no motivation to combine the above two references because neither involve agriculture and their methods and aims are divergent.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael J. Striker', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700